

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's courteous informational telephone interview extended to Applicants' counsel, John Musone. During the discussion, the Examiner explained that Applicants' arguments were unpersuasive because scientific/technical details were not provided to support Applicants' arguments. No amendments have been made to currently pending Claims 21-40, and no new claims have been added or canceled by this Office Action response. Thus, Claims 21-40 remain and are presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider this continuation application and allow the pending claims.

Response to rejections under Sections 102 and 103:

The Examiner contends that the Merrill Declaration reciting "the bubbles have a wall thickness under 45 microns, and the wall thickness is quite likely toward the low end of a 2-40 micron range" is merely a conclusory statement without any supportive evidence and therefore not entitled to any weight. In response, Applicants submit a Supplemental Declaration of Gary Merrill which provides additional scientific/technical details to evidence that Kamo does not teach a wall thickness in the claimed 50-500 micrometer range. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to modify Kamo, since Kamo teaches away from such modification when it explains that "increasing particle size above the range shown will result in a coating that is too thick, not durable, and weakly bonded to the substrate." Col 4 lines 30-32. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Kamo of a wall thickness of 50-500 micrometers.

Additionally, the Kamo bubbles have a melting point of approximately 2300°F (or 1260°C); whereas Applicant's claims recite that the thermal barrier coating is stable at temperatures up to 1600°C. Thus, the Kamo bubbles could not be used.

The Examiner next contends that "because the coating of Kamo uses the same materials and is manufactured in substantially the same way, the claimed packing density would be inherent to the coating". Notwithstanding the differences explained in Applicants' prior Office Action responses, Applicants concede that the broadest reasonable interpretation of the present claim language to pack the ceramic shapes to a density of 20-85%, would read on ceramic shapes packed via chemical, physical, gravity, etc. packing.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 and 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/31/05

By: 
John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830